

EXHIBIT A

**SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK
COUNTY OF NEW YORK**

ARK96 DOE,

Plaintiff,

v.

ARCHDIOCESE OF NEW YORK;
DOMINICAN CONVENT OF OUR
LADY OF THE ROSARY a/k/a
DOMINICAN SISTERS OF
SPARKILL a/k/a DOMINICAN
SISTERS CONGREGATION OF
OUR LADY OF THE ROSARY
a/k/a DOMINICAN SISTERS OF
THE THIRD ORDER OF ST.
DOMINIC CONGREGATION OF
OUR LADY OF THE ROSARY
a/k/a COLLABORATIVE
DOMINICAN NOVITIATE
DOMINICAN SISTERS
CONGREGATION OF OUR LADY
OF THE ROSARY; ST. PAUL'S;
PARISH OF ST. PAUL AND ST.
ANN; and DOES 1-5 whose
identities are unknown to Plaintiff,

Defendants.

Index No. _____

SUMMONS

TO THE ABOVE NAMED DEFENDANTS:

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE THAT YOU ARE HEREBY SUMMONED to answer the Complaint, a copy of which is hereby served upon you, and to serve a copy of your Answer to the Complaint upon the undersigned attorneys listed below within twenty (20) days after the service of this Summons, exclusive of the day of service (or within

thirty (30) days after the service is complete if this Summons is not personally delivered to you within the State of New York); and in the case of your failure to appear or answer, judgment by default will be taken against you for the relief demanded herein.

Dated: August 14, 2019
New York, New York

/s/ Jeffrey R. Anderson
Jeffrey R. Anderson
J. Michael Reck
JEFF ANDERSON & ASSOCIATES, P.A.
52 Duane Street, 7th Floor
New York, NY 10007
Telephone: (646) 759-2551
Email: Jeff@AndersonAdvocates.com
Email: MReck@AndersonAdvocates.com

Patrick Stoneking
Nahid A. Shaikh
ROBINS KAPLAN LLP
399 Park Avenue, Suite 3600
New York, NY 10022
Telephone: (212) 980-7400
Email: PStoneking@RobinsKaplan.com
Email: NShaikh@RobinsKaplan.com

Counsel for Plaintiff

**SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK
COUNTY OF NEW YORK**

ARK96 DOE,

Plaintiff,

v.

ARCHDIOCESE OF NEW YORK;
DOMINICAN CONVENT OF OUR
LADY OF THE ROSARY a/k/a
DOMINICAN SISTERS OF
SPARKILL a/k/a DOMINICAN
SISTERS CONGREGATION OF
OUR LADY OF THE ROSARY
a/k/a DOMINICAN SISTERS OF
THE THIRD ORDER OF ST.
DOMINIC CONGREGATION OF
OUR LADY OF THE ROSARY
a/k/a COLLABORATIVE
DOMINICAN NOVITIATE
DOMINICAN SISTERS
CONGREGATION OF OUR LADY
OF THE ROSARY; ST. PAUL'S;
PARISH OF ST. PAUL AND ST.
ANN; and DOES 1-5 whose
identities are unknown to Plaintiff,

Defendants.

Index No. _____

**COMPLAINT
AND DEMAND
FOR JURY TRIAL**

In approximately 1961, Sister Michael Patrice, O.P. ("Sr. Patrice") sexually abused Plaintiff as a child. While the abuse occurred, Defendants were generally negligent, they negligently employed Sr. Patrice, and gave her access to children, including Plaintiff. This lawsuit arises out of Plaintiff's significant damages from that sexual abuse, described below. Plaintiff, by and through Plaintiff's attorneys, states and alleges as follows:

PARTIES**A. Plaintiff**

1. At all times material to this Complaint, Plaintiff was a student at St. Paul's in Staten Island, New York. At all times material, Plaintiff resided in the State of New York.

2. Plaintiff brings this action under a pseudonym with leave of Court.

B. Defendants

3. Whenever reference is made to any Defendant entity, such reference includes that entity, its parent companies, subsidiaries, affiliates, predecessors, and successors. In addition, whenever reference is made to any act, deed, or transaction of any entity, the allegation means that the entity engaged in the act, deed, or transaction by or through its officers, directors, agents, employees, or representatives while they were actively engaged in the management, direction, control, or transaction of the entity's business or affairs.

4. At all times material, Defendant Archdiocese of New York ("Archdiocese") was and continues to be an organization or entity which includes, but is not limited to, civil corporations, decision making entities, officials, and employees, authorized to conduct business and conducting business in the State of New York with its principal place of business at 1011 First Avenue, New York, NY 10022.

5. The Archdiocese was created in approximately 1850. Later, the Archdiocese created a corporation called the Archdiocese of New York to conduct some of its affairs. The Archdiocese operates its affairs as both a corporate entity and as the organization

known as the Archdiocese of New York. Both of these entities and all other affiliated corporations and entities controlled by the Archbishop are included in this Complaint as the "Archdiocese." The Archdiocese functions as a business by engaging in numerous revenue producing activities and soliciting money from its members in exchange for its services.

6. The Archdiocese has several programs that seek out the participation of children including, but not limited to, schools and other educational programs. The Archdiocese, through its officials, has complete control over those activities and programs involving children. The Archdiocese has the power to appoint, train, supervise, monitor, remove, and terminate each and every person working with children within the Archdiocese.

7. At all times material, Defendant Dominican Convent of Our Lady of the Rosary a/k/a Dominican Sisters of Sparkill a/k/a Dominican Sisters Congregation of Our lady of the Rosary a/k/a Dominican Sisters of the Third Order of St. Dominic Congregation of Our Lady of the Rosary a/k/a Collaborative Dominican Novitiate Dominican Sisters Congregation of Our Lady of the Rosary ("Sisters of Sparkill") was and is a Roman Catholic religious order of women with its principal places of business located at 4928 Washington Blvd., Saint Louis, MO 63108-1621 and 175 Rte. 340, Sparkill, New York 10976. The Sisters of Sparkill were and continue to be an organization or entity which includes, but is not limited to, civil corporations, decision making entities, officials, and employees, authorized to conduct business and conducting business in the State of New York. The Sisters of Sparkill and its agents and employees were and continue to be

responsible for the selection and assignment of personnel, supervision of personal activities, the exercise of authority over various members of its religious order, and the maintenance of the well-being of its members attending schools and parishes which are staffed and/or operated by the Sisters of Sparkill. The Prioress or Mother or President is the top official of the Sisters of Sparkill and is given authority over all matters dealing with the Sisters of Sparkill as a result of her position. The Sisters of Sparkill function as a business by engaging in numerous revenue producing activities and soliciting money in exchange for its services. The Sisters of Sparkill have several programs which seek out the participation of children in the Sisters of Sparkill's activities. The Sisters of Sparkill, through its officials, have control over those activities involving children. The Sisters of Sparkill have the power to appoint, supervise, monitor, and fire each person working with children within the Sisters of Sparkill.

8. At all times material, St. Paul's was an organization authorized to conduct business in the State of New York, with its principal place of business at 113 Lake Road, Congers, NY, 10920. St. Paul's includes, but is not limited to, the St. Paul's corporation and any other organizations and/or entities operating under the same or similar name with the same or similar principal place of business.

9. At all times material, St. Paul's was under the direct authority, control, and province of Defendant Diocese and the Archbishop of the Archdiocese of New York. Defendant St. Paul's includes any school affiliated with St. Paul's. At all times material, the school was under the direct authority, control, and province of Defendant St. Paul's and the Archbishop of the Archdiocese of New York. At all times material, Defendants

St. Paul's and Diocese owned, operated, managed, maintained, and controlled the school.

10. At all times material, Parish of St. Paul and St. Ann ("St. Paul and St. Ann") was and continues to be an organization authorized to conduct business and conducting business in the State of New York, with its principal place of business at 113 Lake Road, Congers, NY, 10920. Upon information and belief, St. Paul's was absorbed into St. Paul and St. Ann in a de facto merger or series of de facto mergers. Upon information and belief St. Paul and St. Ann continued the missions and ministry of St. Paul's, and remained under the direct authority, control and province of the Archdiocese of New York and the Archbishop of the Archdiocese of New York after the merger(s). Upon information and belief St. Paul's ceased ordinary business operations as soon as possible after the transaction(s), and St. Paul and St. Ann assumed St. Paul's liabilities ordinarily necessary for the uninterrupted continuation of St. Paul's operations and business with a continuity of management, personnel, physical location and general business operation. St. Paul and St. Ann includes, but is not limited to, the parish corporation and any other organizations and/or entities operating under the same or similar name with the same or similar principal place of business.

11. At all times material, St. Paul and St. Ann was under the direct authority, control, and province of Defendant Diocese and the Archbishop of the Archdiocese of New York. Defendant St. Paul and St. Ann includes any school affiliated with St. Paul and St. Ann. At all times material, the school was under the direct authority, control, and province of Defendant St. Paul and St. Ann and the Archbishop of the Archdiocese of New York. At all times material, Defendants St. Paul and St. Ann and Diocese owned,

operated, managed, maintained, and controlled the school.

12. For purposes of this Complaint, Defendants St. Paul's and St. Paul and St. Ann are referred to collectively as "Parish."

13. Defendants Does 1 through 5 are unknown agents whose identities will be provided when they become known pursuant to C.P.L.R. § 1024.

JURISDICTION

14. This Court has jurisdiction pursuant to C.P.L.R. § 301 as Defendants' principal places of business are in New York and because the unlawful conduct complained of herein occurred in New York.

15. Venue is proper pursuant to C.P.L.R. § 503 in that New York County is the principal place of business of Defendant Archdiocese. In addition, many of the events giving rise to this action occurred in New York County.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

A. Background

16. The hierarchy of the Roman Catholic Church and, by implication these Defendants, have been aware of the serious problem of sexual abuse of children by its agents and employees since at least the 1800s.

17. Further, Roman Catholic Church officials, including these Defendants, have used their power and influence to prevent victims and their families from disclosing allegations of abuse.

18. Additionally, Plaintiff's relationship to Defendants and Sr. Patrice, as a vulnerable child and student at Parish and School was one in which Plaintiff was subject

to the ongoing influence of Defendants and Sr. Patrice, Plaintiff's abuser.

B. Specific Allegations

19. At all times material, Sr. Patrice was a Roman Catholic sister employed by the Archdiocese, Parish, and Sisters of Sparkill. At all times material, Sr. Patrice was member of the religious order commonly referred to as the Sisters of Sparkill. Sr. Patrice remained under the direct supervision, employ, and control of Defendants.

20. Defendants placed Sr. Patrice in positions where she had access to and worked with children as an integral part of her work.

21. Plaintiff was raised in a devout Roman Catholic family and attended Parish in Staten Island, in the Archdiocese. Plaintiff and Plaintiff's family came in contact with Sr. Patrice as an agent and representative of Defendants, and at St. Paul's.

22. Plaintiff, as a youth, participated in activities at Parish. Plaintiff, therefore, developed great admiration, trust, reverence, and respect for the Roman Catholic Church, including Defendants and their agents, including Sr. Patrice. During and through these activities, Plaintiff, as a minor and vulnerable child, was dependent on Defendants and Sr. Patrice. Defendants had custody of Plaintiff and accepted the entrustment of Plaintiff and, therefore, had responsibility for Plaintiff and authority over Plaintiff.

23. In approximately 1961, when Plaintiff was approximately 6 years old, Sr. Patrice engaged in unpermitted sexual contact with Plaintiff.

COUNT I: NEGLIGENCE

24. Plaintiff realleges paragraphs 1-23 above.

25. Each Defendant owed Plaintiff a duty of reasonable care to protect the

Plaintiff from injury.

26. Each Defendant owed Plaintiff a duty of care because each Defendant had a special relationship with Plaintiff.

27. Defendants also had a duty arising from the special relationship that existed with Plaintiff, Plaintiff's parents, and other parents of young, innocent, vulnerable children in the Archdiocese of New York to properly train and supervise each and every person working in the Archdiocese. This special relationship arose because of the high degree of vulnerability of the children entrusted to their care. As a result of this high degree of vulnerability and risk of sexual abuse inherent in such a special relationship, Defendants had a duty to establish measures of protection not necessary for persons who are older and better able to safeguard themselves.

28. Each Defendant owed Plaintiff a duty to protect Plaintiff from harm because each Defendant also had a special relationship with Sr. Patrice.

29. Defendants owed Plaintiff a duty of reasonable care because they solicited youth and parents for participation in their youth programs; encouraged youth and parents to have the youth participate in their programs; undertook custody of minor children, including Plaintiff; promoted their facilities and programs as being safe for children; held their agents, including Sr. Patrice, out as safe to work with children; encouraged parents and children to spend time with their agents; and/or encouraged their agents, including Sr. Patrice, to spend time with, interact with, and recruit children.

30. By accepting custody of the minor Plaintiff, Defendants established an *in loco parentis* relationship with Plaintiff and in so doing, owed Plaintiff a duty to protect

Plaintiff from injury. Further, Defendants entered into a fiduciary relationship with Plaintiff by undertaking the custody, supervision of, and/or care of the minor Plaintiff. As a result of Plaintiff being a minor, and by Defendants undertaking the care and guidance of the Plaintiff, Defendants also held a position of empowerment over Plaintiff. Further, Defendants, by holding themselves out as being able to provide a safe environment for children, solicited and/or accepted this position of empowerment. Defendants, through its employees, exploited this power over Plaintiff and, thereby, put the minor Plaintiff at risk for sexual abuse.

31. By establishing and/or operating and/or staffing the Archdiocese, Parish, and Sisters of Sparkill accepting the minor Plaintiff as a participant in their programs, holding their facilities and programs out to be a safe environment for Plaintiff, accepting custody of the minor Plaintiff *in loco parentis*, and by establishing a fiduciary relationship with Plaintiff, Defendants entered into an express and/or implied duty to properly supervise Plaintiff and provide a reasonably safe environment for children, who participated in their programs. Defendants owed Plaintiff a duty to properly supervise Plaintiff to prevent harm from foreseeable dangers. Defendants had the duty to exercise the same degree of care over minors under their control as a reasonably prudent person would have exercised under similar circumstances.

32. By establishing and/or operating and/or staffing the Archdiocese, Parish, and Sisters of Sparkill, which offered educational programs to children and which may have included a school, and by accepting the enrollment and participation of the minor Plaintiff as a participant in those educational programs, Defendants owed Plaintiff a duty

to properly supervise Plaintiff to prevent harm from generally foreseeable dangers.

33. Each Defendant owed Plaintiff a duty to protect Plaintiff from harm because Defendants invited Plaintiff onto their property and Sr. Patrice posed a dangerous condition on Defendants' property.

34. Each Defendant breached its duties to Plaintiff. Defendants failed to use ordinary care in determining whether their facilities were safe and/or determining whether they had sufficient information to represent their facilities as safe. Defendants' breach of their duties include, but are not limited to: failure to protect Plaintiff from a known danger, failure to have sufficient policies and procedures in place to prevent child sex abuse, failure to properly implement policies and procedures to prevent child sex abuse, failure to take reasonable measures to ensure that policies and procedures to prevent child sex abuse were working, failure to adequately inform families and children of the risks of child sex abuse, failure to investigate risks of child molestation, failure to properly train the employees at institutions and programs within Defendants' geographical confines, failure to train the minors within Defendants' geographical confines about the dangers of sexual abuse by its agents and employees, failure to have any outside agency test their safety procedures, failure to protect the children in their programs from child sex abuse, failure to adhere to the applicable standard of care for child safety, failure to investigate the amount and type of information necessary to represent the institutions, programs, leaders and people as safe, failure to train their employees properly to identify signs of child molestation by fellow employees, failure by relying upon mental health professionals, and/or failure by relying on people who

claimed that they could treat child molesters.

35. Defendants also breached their duty to Plaintiff by failing to warn Plaintiff and Plaintiff's family of the risk that Sr. Patrice posed and the risks of child sexual abuse in Catholic institutions. They also failed to warn them about any of the knowledge that Defendants had about child sexual abuse.

36. Defendants additionally violated a legal duty by failing to report known and/or suspected abuse of children by Sr. Patrice and/or its other agents to the police and law enforcement.

37. Prior to the sexual abuse of Plaintiff, Defendants learned or should have learned that Sr. Patrice was not fit to work with children. Defendants, by and through their agents, servants and/or employees, became aware, or should have become aware of Sr. Patrice's propensity to commit sexual abuse and of the risk to Plaintiff's safety. At the very least, Defendants knew or should have known that they did not have sufficient information about whether or not their leaders and people working at Parish and School and other Catholic institutions within the Archdiocese of New York were safe.

38. Defendants knew or should have known that there was a risk of child sex abuse for children participating in Catholic programs and activities within the Archdiocese. At the very least, Defendants knew or should have known that they did not have sufficient information about whether or not there was a risk of child sex abuse for children participating in Catholic programs and activities within the Archdiocese.

39. Defendants knew or should have known that Defendants had numerous agents who had sexually molested children. Defendants knew or should have known that

child molesters have a high rate of recidivism. They knew or should have known that there was a specific danger of child sex abuse for children participating in their youth programs.

40. However, despite this knowledge, Defendants negligently deemed that Sr. Patrice was fit to work with children; and/or that any previous suitability problems Sr. Patrice had were fixed and cured; and/or that Sr. Patrice would not sexually molest children; and/or that Sr. Patrice would not injure children.

41. Defendants' actions created a foreseeable risk of harm to Plaintiff. As a vulnerable child participating in the programs and activities Defendants offered to minors, Plaintiff was a foreseeable victim. Additionally, as a vulnerable child who Sr. Patrice had access to through Defendants' facilities and programs, Plaintiff was a foreseeable victim.

42. As a direct result of the foregoing, Plaintiff sustained physical, emotional, and psychological injuries, along with pain and suffering. The sexual abuse and resulting injuries to Plaintiff were caused solely and wholly by reason of the negligent failures of Defendants.

COUNT II: NEGLIGENT TRAINING AND SUPERVISION OF EMPLOYEES

43. Plaintiff realleges paragraphs 1-42 above.

44. At all times material, Sr. Patrice was employed by Defendants and was under each Defendant's direct supervision, employ, and control when she committed the wrongful acts alleged herein. Sr. Patrice engaged in the wrongful conduct while acting in the course and scope of her employment with Defendants and/or accomplished the

sexual abuse by virtue of her job-created authority.

45. Defendants had a duty, arising from their employment of Sr. Patrice, to ensure that he did not sexually molest children.

46. Further, Defendants owed a duty to train and educate employees and administrators and establish adequate and effective policies and procedures calculated to detect, prevent, and address inappropriate behavior and conduct between its agents and employees and children.

47. Defendants were negligent in the training, supervision, and instruction of their employees. Defendants failed to timely and properly educate, train, supervise, and/or monitor their agents or employees with regard to policies and procedures that should be followed when sexual abuse of a child is suspected or observed. Defendants were additionally negligent in failing to supervise, monitor, chaperone, and/or investigate Sr. Patrice and/or in failing to create, institute, and/or enforce rules, policies, procedures, and/or regulations to prevent Sr. Patrice's sexual abuse of Plaintiff. In failing to properly supervise Sr. Patrice, and in failing to establish such training procedures for employees and administrators, Defendants failed to exercise the degree of care that a reasonably prudent person would have exercised under similar circumstances.

48. As a direct result of the foregoing, Plaintiff sustained physical, emotional, and psychological injuries, along with pain and suffering. The sexual abuse and resulting injuries to Plaintiff were caused solely and wholly by reason of the negligent failures of Defendants in the training and/or supervising of its employees.

COUNT III: NEGLIGENT RETENTION OF EMPLOYEES

49. Plaintiff realleges paragraphs 1-48 above.

50. At all times material, Sr. Patrice was employed by Defendants and was under each Defendant's direct supervision, employ, and control when she committed the wrongful acts alleged herein.

51. Defendants negligently retained Sr. Patrice with knowledge of Sr. Patrice's propensity for the type of behavior which resulted in Plaintiff's injuries in this action. Defendants failed to investigate Sr. Patrice's past and/or current history of sexual abuse and, through the exercise of reasonable diligence, should have known of Sr. Patrice's propensity for child sexual abuse. Defendants should have made an appropriate investigation of Sr. Patrice and failed to do so. An appropriate investigation would have revealed the unsuitability of Sr. Patrice for continued employment and it was unreasonable for Defendants to retain Sr. Patrice in light of the information they knew or should have known.

52. Defendants negligently retained Sr. Patrice in a position where she had access to children and could foreseeably cause harm which Plaintiff would not have been subjected to had Defendants taken reasonable care.

53. In failing to timely remove Sr. Patrice from working with children or terminate the employment of Sr. Patrice, Defendants failed to exercise the degree of care that a reasonably prudent person would have exercised under similar circumstances.

54. As a direct result of the foregoing, Plaintiff sustained physical, emotional, and psychological injuries, along with pain and suffering. The sexual abuse and resulting

injuries to Plaintiff were caused solely and wholly by reason of the negligent failures of Defendants in the retention of its employees.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, based on the foregoing causes of action, Plaintiff prays for judgment against Defendants in an amount that will fully and fairly compensate Plaintiff for Plaintiff's injuries and damages and for any other relief the Court deems appropriate. The amount of damages sought in this Complaint exceeds the jurisdictional limits of all lower courts which would otherwise have jurisdiction.

JURY DEMAND

Plaintiff demands a trial by jury of all issues so triable. Pursuant to §4 of the New York Child Victims Act, Plaintiff is entitled to a trial preference.

Dated: August 14, 2019
New York, New York

/s/ Jeffrey R. Anderson
Jeffrey R. Anderson
J. Michael Reck
JEFF ANDERSON & ASSOCIATES, P.A.
52 Duane Street, 7th Floor
New York, NY 10007
Telephone: (646) 759-2551
Email: Jeff@AndersonAdvocates.com
Email: MReck@AndersonAdvocates.com

Patrick Stoneking
Nahid A. Shaikh
ROBINS KAPLAN LLP
399 Park Avenue, Suite 3600
New York, NY 10022
Telephone: (212) 980-7400
Email: PStoneking@RobinsKaplan.com
Email: NShaikh@RobinsKaplan.com

Counsel for Plaintiff